

I am disturbed by Sinclair Broadcasting requiring their stations to carry an hour-long, one-sided, anti-John Kerry documentary right before an extremely tight Presidential election. I believe the FCC should be too.

This documentary clearly does not qualify as news programming, but rather is an attempt by one corporation to swing an election -- a number of their stations are in swing states, and Sinclair has made their political agenda clear. Because a broadcaster uses airwaves which belong to all Americans, they have a moral and a legal obligation to serve the public interest. Trying to influence an election with a "must-carry" hour-long political attack ad is clearly not in the public interest.

I find it very disturbing that the FCC could make disregarding fairness and balance in broadcast media even easier for companies like Sinclair. Sinclair already owns multiple stations even within single markets like nearby San Antonio. Should they be allowed to own three? four? Perhaps several radio stations and the local newspaper too? Americans of both political parties are concerned about media consolidation in an age when broadcasters regard the once respected Fairness Doctrine as if it had been written on toilet paper. In an age when more and more people rely on television to keep them informed about complex issues, they need balanced reporting about local issues, not political propaganda. Sinclair is a clear example of how media consolidation threatens democracy.

Though it appears, under current leadership, that the FCC would rather ignore these threats and concentrate on the likes of Janet Jackson, I respectfully request that you look beyond partisan politics and big business interests and concentrate on what is in the public interest. Please inform Sinclair that disregarding balance in political coverage at such a time will be considered when it comes time to renew their broadcast license and may result in it being revoked.

Thank you.